



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,536	06/11/2001	Paul Patrick	BEAS-01084US0 SRM/KFK	4065
23910	7590	12/20/2004	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			PICH. PONNOREAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No. 09/878,536	Applicant(s) PATRICK, PAUL	
	Examiner Ponnoreay Pich	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/878,536</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-39 have been examined and are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7, 24, 30-33, and 36-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Claims 7 and 24 recites the limitation "said access decisions" in line 1. There are insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. The examiner assumes the applicant meant to state "said contributory decisions."
2. Claim 30 recites the limitation "said step of communicating" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
3. Claim 36 recites the limitation "the type of access" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Any claims not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of dependency.
Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2135

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 5-13, 15, 17-19, 22, 30, 32, and 34-39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wiederhold (U.S. 6,226,745).

1. Claims 1 and 18: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 1 and method as in claim 18 for allowing a client to access a protected resource, comprising:

- Receiving at an application interface mechanism an access request from a client application to access a protected resource and communicating said access request to a security service (col 4, lines 56-58).
- Making a decision at said security service to permit or deny said access request (col 5, lines 1-10).
- Communicating via a resource interface permitted access requests to said protected resource (col 4, lines 49-55).

An application interface mechanism for receiving requests from a client application must inherently exist or the mediator disclosed by Wiederhold would not be able to receive/intercept queries related to a protected resource. The security service disclosed by Wiederhold consists of what he calls a "security mediator" and/or a "security officer."

2. Claims 2 and 19: Wiederhold discloses a security system and method of claims 1 and 18 respectively wherein said application interface mechanism includes an application container for reading an application deployment description and registering said deployment description within the security service (col 3, lines 37-46).

An application container is an environment in which an application runs. This can include hardware or software. It is inherent that if an application exists, an application container must also exist.

3. Claims 5 and 22: Wiederhold discloses a security system and method of claim 1 and claim 18 respectively wherein said security system and said method further comprises:
 - Defining an access policy via a plurality of access decision mechanisms within said security service (col 3, lines 37-45; fig 3, item 100; and fig 4, item 200).
 - Determining at each access decision mechanism a contributory decision to permit, deny, or abstain from said access request (col 5, 1st paragraph).

The examiner has interpreted "access decision mechanisms" as broadly as reasonable to include any rule, procedure, device, data structure, or function that is used by the security service to define an access policy.

4. Claims 6 and 23: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 further including an access controller for and a method of claim 22 further comprising

transferring via said access controller said access request to said plurality of access decision mechanisms, and combining contributory decisions into an overall decision by the security service to permit or deny said access request (col 3, lines 37-64).

5. Claims 7 and 24: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 and a method of claim 22 wherein said contributory access decisions represent a business function related access policy (col 3, lines 37-64 and col 5, lines 11-16).

The examiner has interpreted "business function related access policy" to mean any sort of access policy as any access policy can affect the way a business operates. Therefore, the examiner has interpreted claims 7 and 24 to mean that contributory access decisions are made based on access policies or rules.

6. Claims 8 and 25: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 and method of claim 22 wherein access decisions may be added to the security service to reflect changes in the access policy (col 5, lines 34-41).
7. Claims 9 and 26: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 and method of claim 22 wherein said access decision mechanisms are used to define an entitlement for said client to access said protected resource (col 4, last paragraph).
8. Claims 10 and 27: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 and a method of claim 22 wherein a deny or abstain by any on of said access

decision mechanisms cause the security service to deny the access request (col 5, 1st paragraph).

9. Claims 11 and 28: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 and a method of claim 22 wherein an abstain by any one of said decision mechanisms des not cause the security service to deny the access request (col 5, 1st paragraph).
10. Claims 12 and 29: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 5 wherein said security service further includes an audit mechanism for and a method of claim 22 wherein said auditing via said audit mechanism the determinations of said plurality of access requests (col 5, last paragraph and col 6, lines 1-2).
11. Claims 13 and 30: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 1 and a method of claim 18 wherein communicating via a resource interface includes passing requests via an interface mechanism to or from a protected resource (col 5, lines 28-31 and col 5, lines 56-61).
12. Claims 15 and 32: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 13 and method of claim 30 wherein said interface mechanism includes a security provider interface (col 4, last paragraph).

The examiner has interpreted a "security provider interface" as any mechanism which allows a user or application to access the resource in secure manner. In the case of Wiederhold's invention, the security service itself is the security provider interface as it filters the results of an access

query to disclose only the parts of a secure resource that a user or application has proper entitlement to have.

13. Claims 17 and 34: Wiederhold discloses a security system of claim 1 wherein said security service further includes and a method of claim 18 further comprising making a decision on whether to permit or deny a response to said access request from said protected resource to said client (col 4, last paragraph).

14. Claim 35: Wiederhold discloses a method for determining a user entitlement to access protected resources in a secure environment, comprising:

- Receiving an access requests from a user application to access a protected resource (fig 2 and col 4, last paragraph).
- Invoking a security service with said access request (fig 2 and col 3, lines 22-26).
- Determining a user entitlement to access said protected resource (col 3, lines 37-45).
- Making a decision at said security service based on said user entitlement to permit or deny said access request (col 5, 1st paragraph).
- The steps of either:
 - a) Communicating a permitted access request to said protected resource (col 5, 1st paragraph), or

b) Denying a denied access request to said protected resource
(col 5, 1st paragraph).

15. Claim 36: Wiederhold discloses a method of claim 35 wherein said entitlement determines a type of access available to the user of said protected resource (col 6, lines 11-21).

16. Claim 37: Wiederhold discloses a method of claim 36 wherein said type of access includes any of view, modify, delete, or copy, any part or all of said protected resource (col 6, lines 19-32).

View, modify, delete, or copy, any part or all of a resource are the types of functions normally performed on a resource when performing database queries.

17. Claim 38: Wiederhold discloses a method of claim 55 wherein information about said user entitlement can be communicated from a first security realm to a second security realm (col 5, 1st paragraph).

The examiner has interpreted a security realm as any individual portion of the overall system. In this case, the security mediator, security officer, protected resource, and client are all separate security realms.

18. Claim 39: Wiederhold discloses a method of claim 38 wherein additional information from a first security realm can be used to modify the user entitlement, prior to communicating information about said user entitlement from said first security realm to said second security realm (col 5, 1st paragraph).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 14, 16, 20, 21, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold (U.S. 6,226,745) and in view of java.sun.com, and/or javaworld.com.

1. Claims 3 and 20: Wiederhold does not teach a security system and method of claims 2 and 19 respectively wherein said application container is an Enterprise Java Bean container. However, javaworld.com discloses that one of the advantages of using an Enterprise Java Bean as a container is that an application would have almost transparent scalability (EJB advantages, item 3). As Wiederhold discloses that his/her invention could be used in a variety of environments from insurance companies, hospitals, and a military setting, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use an Enterprise Java Bean container as this would allow the invention of Wiederhold to be scaled appropriately and easily for what ever type of environment it needs to operate.
2. Claims 4 and 21: Wiederhold does not disclose a security system of claim 2 and a method of claim 21 wherein said application container is a WebApp

container. The examiner has interpreted WebApp to be the same thing as a web or Internet application and a WebApp container as a container which uses or runs on the web or Internet. Given that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use Java technology in Wiederhold's invention because of the advantages disclosed by javaworld.com (EJB advantages), it would also have been obvious that the application container can also be a WebApp container as Java is platform independent and commonly used in web or Internet based applications. Wiederhold discloses that his/her invention can be used by groups of people not normally found close together such as a hospital staff with an insurance company staff, it would have been obvious to use the Internet as a medium for sharing information and data between the various user groups. Since the Internet is used as the communication medium, it would be obvious to use a WebApp as the application container in Wiederhold's invention to ensure data proper data privacy between the various groups as seen in Fig. 1.

3. Claims 14 and 31: Wiederhold does not teach a security system of claim 13 and a method of claim 30 wherein said interface mechanism includes a Java J2EE security interface. However, as pointed out already, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use Enterprise Java Bean technology with Wiederhold's invention. Further, according to java.sun.com, Enterprise Java Beans

technology is "the server-side component architecture for the Java 2 Platform, Enterprise Edition (J2EE) platform" (java.sun.com, 1st paragraph). Therefore, it would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to make the interface mechanism include a Java J2EE security interface as using Enterprise Java Bean/J2EE technology would make the invention more flexible in terms of scalability.

4. Claim 16 and 33: Wiederhold does not teach a security system of claim 13 and method of claim 30 wherein said interface mechanism is included as a plug-in in said resource interface. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Wiederhold's invention so that the interface mechanism is included as a plug-in in the resource interface as doing so would increase the scalability of the invention. If one were to implement the invention using Java and as a web application, Java itself is a plug-in for various web browsers, therefore any interface mechanism employed using Java would have to be a plug-in by nature.

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied up is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure:

- Shanton (U.S. 5,369,702): Discloses securing data via an object oriented approach using containers and encryption.

Art Unit: 2135

- Rivera et al (U.S. 2002/010713): Discloses a system for remotely viewing documents and positive results using J2EE technology.
- Reid et al (U.S. 6,182,226): Discloses a firewall being used to separate a network into different regions and to limit resource access between the different regions.
- Okamoto (published 1992): Discloses the concept of an integrated security system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ponnoreay Pich whose telephone number is 571-272-7962. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PP


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2